

## **Remarks**

This REPLY is in response to the Office Action mailed April 17, 2008.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Prior to the Office Action mailed April 17, 2008, Claims 1, 3, 5-12, 14-22, 24, and 26-33 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12, 14-20, 22, 24, 26-31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0120686 A1, hereafter Kim) in view of Tanyi (Easy XML, 2000) and in further view of Park et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0024812 A1, hereafter Park). Claims 11, 21, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Tanyi in further view of Park and in further view of IBM TDB (Method and System for Visually Constructing Document Type Definitions and Related Artifacts Using a Reusable Object Model, 2001).

### **II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments**

The present Response amends Claims 1, 12, 22, and 33, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 3, 5-12, 14-22, 24, and 26-33. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

### **III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

In the Office Action mailed April 17, 2008, Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12, 14-20, 22, 24, 26-31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0120686 A1, hereafter Kim) in view of Tanyi (Easy XML, 2000) and in further view of Park et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0024812 A1, hereafter Park). Claims 11, 21, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of Tanyi in further view of Park and in further view of IBM TDB (Method and System for Visually Constructing Document Type Definitions and Related Artifacts Using a Reusable Object Model, 2001).

#### **Claim 1**

Claim 1 has been amended by the present Response to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *(Currently Amended) An interactive tool for viewing and manipulating a virtual content repository (VCR) having an application program interface (API), comprising:*
  - providing a first graphical user interface (GUI) configured to present a hierarchical namespace that spans information in a plurality of content repositories represented by the virtual content repository, wherein the namespace includes at least one element, and wherein one of the at least one element can be selected;*
  - providing a second GUI configured to present and to enable editing of content associated with the selected element in the first GUI;*
  - providing a third GUI configured to present and to enable editing of schema associated with the selected element in the first GUI; and*
  - wherein the VCR logically represents the plurality of content repositories as a single content repository;*
  - wherein each one of the plurality of content repositories represented by the VCR includes a service provider interface (SPI) compatible with the API; and*
  - wherein the SPI enables each one of the plurality of content repositories to be integrated into the VCR.*

First, it is respectfully submitted that Kim does not appear to disclose *wherein each one of the plurality of content repositories represented by the VCR includes a service provider interface (SPI) compatible with the API*. In the Office Action mailed April 17, 2008, it was submitted that Kim discloses the above claim feature because “Kim teaches having to access files on a service server, the files located on the service server are converted for display in a browser.” However, the disclosure of files being accessed on a service server does not appear to have any bearing on whether each one of the plurality of content repositories represented by the VCR includes a service provider interface compatible with the API, nor does calling the server a service server appear to have any bearing on whether a content repository has a SPI. In addition, while Kim appears to disclose a single server that is accessed, the cited passage does not appear to disclose wherein each one of the plurality of content repositories represented by the VCR includes a SPI.

Second, it is also respectfully submitted that Park does not appear to disclose *wherein the SPI enables each one of the plurality of content repositories to be integrated into the VCR*. In the Office Action mailed April 17, 2008, it was submitted that Park discloses the above claim

feature because “Park teaches the content producer teaches having an integrate search service for integrating data from various sources and allowing for search base on search condition.” Park discloses a single content repository that has, as its basic units of storage, containers (paragraph [0041]). However, even if it is argued that an integrated search service is an SPI, and that containers are content repositories, Park does not appear to disclose that each container includes a search service. Instead, according to Figure 1 of Park, the various search services (dynamic search/comparison service (1b), web integration service (1c)) disclosed in Park are wholly separate from the repository (8).

Furthermore, the search and integration services disclosed in Park do not appear to enable the plurality of content repositories to be integrated into the VCR. Even if it is argued, as submitted by the Office Action, that the containers disclosed in Park teach a plurality of content repositories, those containers are merely stored, like files, into the content repository disclosed in Park. However, not only do the search and integration services disclosed in Park do not appear to be involved in enabling the storing of those containers into the content repository, the search and integration services are not included in each one of a plurality of content repositories.

In addition, in the Office Action mailed April 17, 2008, it was further submitted that Park discloses a SPI compatible with the API because “Park teaches content producers can use the content manipulation API in the service publication server.” However, the teaching of Park that a user (content producer) can use an API on a server does not appear to disclose anything related to the compatibility of an SPI included in the plurality of content repositories and an API of a virtual content repository.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### **Claims 12, 22, and 33**

Claims 12, 22, and 33 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12, 22, and 33, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

**Claims 3, 5-11, 14-21, 24, and 26-32**

Claims 3, 5-11, 14-21, 24, and 26-32 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3, 5-11, 14-21, 24, and 26-32 are similarly neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also respectfully submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

**IV. Conclusion**

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 17, 2008

By: /Guanyao Cheng/  
Guanyao Cheng  
Reg. No. 58,555

FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800  
Customer No. 23910